

1

## REMARKS

2

### Amendments to the Claims:

3       Claims 1, 2, 4 and 8 have been amended. Claims 1 and 4 have each been  
4       amended to add various limitations. Support for the amendments to each of claims 1  
5       and 4 can be found at least in Figs. 4 and/or 5. Claim 2 has been amended to add  
6       all the limitations of claim 22, which depended from claim 2. Accordingly, claim 22  
7       has been canceled as being redundant in view of the amendments to claim 2. Claim  
8       8 has been amended to include all the limitations of claim 23, which depended from  
claim 8. Accordingly, claim 23 has been canceled as being redundant in view of the  
amendments to claim 8.

10

### Allowable Subject Matter:

11       Claims 3 and 9 have each been objected to as being dependent upon a  
12       rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including  
13       all the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

14       The applicant notes that in previous amendments, claim 3 was canceled and  
15       then added in its original form as claim 22. Likewise, claim 9 was previously  
16       canceled and then added in its original form as claim 23. The applicant notes further  
17       that claim 22 (formerly claim 3) depended from claim 2 and that claim 23 (formerly  
18       claim 9) depended from claim 8. Thus, the applicant assumes that the examiner  
intended to indicate claim 22 rather than claim 3, and to indicate claim 23 rather than  
claim 9.

19       Rather than amend claims 22 and 23, the applicant has chosen to amend the  
20       base claims (2 and 8). That is, the applicant has hereby amended claim 2 to include  
21       all of the limitations of claim 22 (formerly claim 3), and has hereby amended claim 8  
22       to include all of the limitations of claim 23 (formerly claim 9). Thus, claim 2 is an  
independent claim that now includes all the limitations of original claim 3, and claim 8  
23       is an independent claim that now includes all the limitations of original claim 9. That  
24       is, the amendments to claim 2 have overcome the objection to claim 3 and the  
amendments to claim 8 have overcome the objection to claim 9. Accordingly, the  
25       applicant contends that claims 2 and 8 are now allowable.

26       Claims 10-21 have also been allowed. The examiner has indicated that at  
least claims 10-21 are allowable over the prior art of record because none of the

1 prior art of record teaches or fairly suggests storing a cartridge stamp in the cartridge  
2 memory, updating the set of label data stored in the cartridge memory, and then  
3 updating the cartridge stamp in response to updating the set of label data.

4 The applicant agrees with the examiner's conclusions regarding patentability,  
5 without necessarily agreeing with, or acquiescing in, the examiner's reasoning. In  
6 particular, the applicant believes that the claims are allowable because the prior art  
7 fails to teach, anticipate, or render obvious the invention as claimed, independent of  
how the invention is paraphrased.

8 Rejection of Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 102:

9 Claims 1, 2, and 4-8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being  
10 anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,867,335 to Ozue et al.

11 Claim 1 has been amended to now include all the limitations that the examiner  
12 has indicated are not taught or disclosed by the prior art of record. That is, claim 1  
13 has been amended to now include substantially the limitations of storing a cartridge  
14 stamp in the cartridge memory, updating the set of label data stored in the cartridge  
15 memory, and then updating the cartridge stamp in response to updating the set of  
label data. Accordingly, claim 1 is now allowable.

16 Claim 2 has been amended to be essentially identical to the original claim 3,  
17 which the examiner has indicated as being allowable. A more detailed explanation  
18 of the amendments to claim 2 is provided above. Accordingly, claim 2 is now  
allowable.

19 Claim 4 has been amended to now include all the limitations that the examiner  
20 has indicated are not taught or disclosed by the prior art of record. That is, claim 4  
21 has been amended to now include substantially the limitations of storing a cartridge  
22 stamp in the cartridge memory, updating the set of label data stored in the cartridge  
23 memory, and then updating the cartridge stamp in response to updating the set of  
label data. Accordingly, claim 4 is now allowable.

24 Claims 5-7 depend from claim 2. Each of claims 5-7 are therefore allowable  
25 for at least the reasons that claim 2 is allowable, as set forth above.

Claim 8 has been amended to be essentially identical to the original claim 9,  
which the examiner has indicated as being allowable. A more detailed explanation

1 of the amendments to claim 8 is provided above. Accordingly, claim 8 is  
2 now allowable.

## SUMMARY

The applicant believes this response constitutes a full and complete reply to the Office action mailed on 11/28/2005. The applicant further believes that claims 1, 2, 4-8, and 10-21 are in allowable form, and that the application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,  
Steve Jerman, Applicant

by Thomas Olson  
Attorney for Applicant  
Reg. No. 44,271  
(509) 327-4748

Date: February 10, 2006